

UNIVERSITY IMPACT DISTRICT REVIEW BOARD

111 North Front Street, Third Floor

Columbus, Ohio 43215

P (614) 645-8062

MEETING SUMMARY

date

January 24, 2019

place

Michael B Coleman Government Center Hearing Room

111 North Front Street, Room 204

time

4:00pm – 7:05pm

present

Doreen Uhas Sauer, Frank Petruziello, Steven Papineau, Kerry Reeds, Pasquali Grado, Kerry Reeds, Keoni Fleming (arrived at 5:50)

absent

A. 4:05 Business of the Board

1. Approval of Meeting Summary from December 20, 2019

motion by Ms. Uhas Sauer / Mr. Grado

Motion To approve the meeting summary as submitted.

Vote

6-0

B. Applications for Certificate of Approval

1. address: 214 East 16th Avenue Multi-Family

app no.: UID_19-01-006

applicant: Chadwich Rice T&T Windows

reviewed: Windows

4:04 – 4:20

Staff Report:

- Mr. Teba presented a staff report and slides of the site location and existing site conditions.
- Mr. Rice presented the proposal and the windows.

discussion:

- Mr. Petruziello said the white windows were the biggest issue.
- Ms. Jones wanted to know what color they were going to paint the building.
- Mr. Rice stated that he wasn't sure. He added that the windows weren't original
- Ms. Jones said she didn't like the muttons, and didn't feel that the windows needed the fake muttons.
- Mr. Rice agreed.
- Mr. Petruziello said that the windows were ok, but the biggest issue was the color. He asked what other colors they could get.
- Mr. Rice stated that they could get additional colors, but they would be more expensive.
- Mr. Petruziello asked if they would be as expensive as a clad window
- Mr. Rice said they would not.
- Mr. Petruziello asked if they could be custom sized.
- Mr. Rice said they could.
- Mr. Petruziello said they couldn't compromise on color and materials. They could compromise on the materials, but not the color.
- Mr. Rice stated that they also sold the sample they brought in brown.
- Mr. Petruziello said brown was not ok. Medium gray would be acceptable.
- Ms. Jones said that they should come back with a total revision of the dwelling with the updated color pallet and windows.

- Mr. Rice asked to return with additional information.

motion by

motion

vote

Tabled

2. address
app no.:
applicant:
reviewed:
4:20 – 4:40

60 East Norwich Avenue
UID_19-01-007
Chad Mooney / Robert Corwin
Windows

Multi-family

Staff report:

- Mr. Teba presented a staff report and slides of the site location and existing site conditions.
- Mr. Corwin presented the proposal.
- Ms. Jones asked how many windows there were
- Mr. Corwin answered that there were 170 windows, 47 on the front façade
- Mr. Petruziello asked the applicant if they had priced out the difference between the vinyl windows and aluminum clad six-pane windows.
- Mr. Corwin replied that the difference in price was \$80,000 for all vinyl windows, and \$160,000-\$180,000 for reproduction windows.
- Ms. Jones asked if they could compromise and do the front section of the building in aluminum windows.
- Mr. Corwin stated that he was going to propose such a compromise. Put aluminum replacement windows on the front, and black vinyl on the rest of the building.
- Mr. Petruziello answered that the sides of the front section would also need to be aluminum replacement.
- Ms. Jones agreed that it would have to extend to the two bays of windows on the sides.
- Mr. Corwin mentioned that the reason for changing the windows was for efficiency reasons.
- Ms. Uhas-Jones asked if the windows were operable.
- Mr. Corwin answered that many were not.
- Ms. Uhas-Sauer stated that she use to live in the building, but asked if an interior storm window solution was a possibility.
- Mr. Corwin replied that it cost \$80,000 and wasn't worth it.
- Ms. Uhas-Sauer stated that they thought it was a Howard Dwight Smith building. Combined with some other buildings in the area it could be a potential addition to Northwood Park Historic District.
- Ms. Jones asked if they could get historic tax credits.
- Ms. Uhas-Jones said it would take several years.
- Mr. Petruziello stated they should focus on high quality in the front that would almost exactly match what is there, but could save a bit in the rear.
- Mr. Grado stated they could place four casement or two casements and two fixed windows in the rear of the structure. But double-hung windows would not be acceptable.
- Mr. Petruziello stated they should come back with various options of what they can afford, and then return for a discussion with the board.

discussion:
motion by
Motion

Tabled

Vote

3. address
app no.:
applicant:
reviewed:
4:40 – 4:50

2160 North High Street
UID_18-11-004
Tracy Diehl
Signs

CVS

Recusal
Staff Report:

Mr. Petruziello Recused himself.

discussion:

- Mr. Teba presented a staff report and slides of the site location and existing site conditions.
- Ms. Diehl presented the proposal
- Ms. Uhas-Grado stated they had been responsive to the directions that the board gave them in November

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Ms. Jones asked if all the signs were in red.• Ms. Diehl answered that they were all in white.• Ms. Jones asked if the Minute-Clinic sign wasn't too large inside the southside glass window.• Ms. Diehl asked if could go above the door.• Ms. Jones said that she felt that would be a better location for it.	
Motion by:	Ms. Jones / Mr. Grado	
Motion	<p>To approve the proposal with the following conditions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Sign #5 must be returned to its existing location above the main entrance and removed from the south elevation glazing.	
Vote:	5-0 to approve	
4. address	1227 North High Street	Condado
app no.:	UID_19-01-008	
applicant:	Jim McFarland	
reviewed:	Signs	
4:50 – 4:55		
Staff Report:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Mr. Teba presented a staff report and slides of the site location and existing site conditions.• Mr. McFarland presented the proposal	
discussion:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Mr. Petruziello asked for clarification on the changes being proposed.• Mr. Teba read the approved conditions from the December meeting, and indicated that the only changes was the addition of "Tacos" to the projecting sign.• Mr. Reed indicated that the arrow interrupting the blue outline looked strange to him.• Mr. McFarland said the wanted to maintain the directional nature of the sign.	
Motion by:	Ms. Jones / Mr. Petruziello	
Motion	To approve the proposal as presented.	
Vote:	6-0 to approve	
5. address	15 East Lane Avenue	Verizon
app no.:	UID_18-07-005	
applicant:	Rob Ferguson/ United Acquisition Services, Inc.	
reviewed:	Rooftop Antennas	
4:55 – 5:20		
Staff Report:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Mr. Teba presented a staff report and slides of the site location and existing site conditions.• Rob Ferguson presented the proposal	
discussion:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Mr. Petruziello asked if the antennas had to extend beyond the parapet wall.• Mr. Furguson stated they could be pushed back but then they would need to be raised higher.• Ms. Jones replied that she preferred that solution so that the antennas could not be seen from the street.• Mr. Petruziello asked why the C3 and C6 images did not match the sectional views.• Mr. Teba explained that the images submitted did not match. He had informed the applicant of that issue before the meeting.• Mr. Ferguson added that the sectional views were incorrect.• Mr. Petruziello added that all four extend beyond the face of the façade.• Mr. Grado asked what color they would be.• Mr. Ferguson said they were a whitish gray.• Mr. Reeds asked the applicant if they could come in different colors.	

<p>Motion by:</p> <p>Motion</p> <p>Vote:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Ferguson said they could. <p>Mr. Petruziello / Ms. Jones</p> <p>To approve the proposal with the following conditions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Antennas will be pushed back until the farthest protruding front face of the antennas are behind the plane created by the rear of the parapet wall. • Antenna height be increased only as necessary, however, the height can only be increased up to 8'6". • Color will not be white <p>6-0 to approve</p>
<p>6. address</p> <p>app no.:</p> <p>applicant:</p> <p>reviewed:</p> <p>4:55 – 5:20</p> <p>Staff Report:</p> <p>discussion:</p> <p>Motion by:</p> <p>Motion</p> <p>Vote:</p>	<div> <div>15 East Lane Avenue</div> <div>Ninja Grill</div> </div> <p>UID_19-01-009</p> <p>Sean Clark/DaNite Sign Co.</p> <p>Signs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Teba presented a staff report and slides of the site location and existing site conditions. • Mr. Clark presented the proposal <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ms. Jones asked why the sign wasn't centered. • The Clark added that it was centered on the store frontage of the Ninja Grill, Starbucks was to the right. • Ms. Jones said they should center it between the two stone columns. • Mr. Petruziello added that it could be moved further to the left. • Mr. Grado said it should be centered between the stone columns. • Mr. Clark was concerned that it wouldn't direct people to the entrance, and that they couldn't place a sign over a neighboring tenant space. • Mr. Reeds asked why it wasn't centered vertically on the sign band. • The applicant said it should be. • Mr. Petruziello asked what the small medallion was. • Mr. Clark said it was the restaurant's logo. • Mr. Grado asked if the poke and hibachi lettering constituted advertising. • Mr. Clark answered that it was part of the business name. • Mr. Petruziello asked why the medallion wasn't a blade sign? • Mr. Clark replied that was what the applicant requested. • Mr. Petruziello stated that it would be easier to approve a blade sign. The sign should be moved to the left, the circle should be a blade sign in the middle of the sign band. • Mr. Grado replied that the blade sign made more sense on the stone column to the left most masonry piece. • Ms. Jones supported the conditions, but the sign company should work with the applicant. • Mr. Papineau said they could approve the wall sign today, and then come back for a blade sign. <p>Mr. Reeds/ Mr. Petruziello</p> <p>To approve the proposal with the following conditions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove the medallion from the wall sign • Move the sign to the left, and center it on the left three boxes on the sign band. • No exposed wiring or conduit. <p>6-0 to approve</p>

7. address app no.: applicant: reviewed: 5:20 – 5:35 Staff Report:	<div> <div> 1607 North High Street UID_19-01-010 Palmo Aracri Awning </div> <div>Aracri Pizzeria</div> </div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Teba presented a staff report and slides of the site location and existing site conditions. • Mr. Aracri presented the proposal <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ms. Jones asked if the sign band would be blank. • Mr. Aracri said it would be, but he wanted to put goose neck lighting up in that area lighting the awning. • Mr. Grado didn't agree with the location of the sign and wondered why they couldn't put in on the skirt. • Mr. Aracri said it would be too many letters. • Ms. Grado said the address could go on the glass. The name on the pizzeria should go on the skirt, and the establishment date and address on the glass. • Mr. Petruziello asked what the pitch of the awning was. • Mr. Teba said it was 60. • Ms. Jones stated that it would be difficult to read the awning due to the angle of the awning and its height above the street. • Mr. Petruziello asked if other businesses in the Gateway have awnings signage designed in a similar manner. • Mr. Aracri said T-Mobile did. • Mr. Teba showed street views of the area, and added that T-Mobile was a sign and not an awning. Also, most of the awnings in the area had the names on the skirts. • Mr. Petruziello stated that the top of the awnings were more visible than he expected. He liked the proposal with the goose neck lighting. It was very restrained. • Ms. Jones agreed. • Mr. Grado said that having it on the incline surface was proposing was inconsistent with what the board had been approving in the gateway. • Ms. Jones replied that having the business names on the skirts seemed too tight and didn't look particularly engaging. She liked four goose neck lights. • Mr. Petruziello added that four or three would be ok, but not two • Mr. Reeds said he liked three. • Ms. Jones explained that they could line up with the window frames if there were four. • Mr. Grado asked if there shouldn't be greater dimensional details.
discussion:	
Motion by:	Ms. Jones / Mr. Reeds
Motion	To approve the proposal with the following conditions. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aracri Pizzeria should be centered vertically on the black awning.
Vote:	6-0 to approve
8. address app no.: applicant: reviewed: 5:35 – 5:50 Staff Report:	<div> <div> 1770 Indianola Avenue UID_19_01-011 Mitch Acock/Zaco Inc. New Construction/Variance </div> <div>Chi Omega</div> </div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Teba presented a staff report and slides of the site location and existing site conditions. • Mr. Acock presented the proposal <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The variance was approved. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Petruziello asked why the windows on the southern façade were different than the windows
discussion:	

	<p>on the western façade.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Acock replied that it was an error that should be corrected. The western façade is correct. • Mr. Petruziello observed that the fence railing on the southern façade were a little out of character. • Mr. Acock answered that it was only screening to block AC units, not a real balcony. • Mr. Petruziello asked that they redesign it to respect the brick bays, it shouldn't look like a fence. • Mr. Acock agreed. • Ms. Jones asked if the northern façade was brick painted white. • Mr. Acock said it was hardiplank. • Mr. Petruziello asked why it was white. • Mr. Acock said it was typical. • Ms. Jones stated that this was a huge improvement, and she was happy to see it. • Mr. Grado asked if they could sign off on the variance without it going to the UAC first. • Mr. Acock said the hearing would be the 4th Tuesday for BZA. • Mr. Petruziello said they could approve it subject to staff approval after the BZA hearings. <p><u>Variance</u> Ms. Jones/ Mr. Petruziello Approved the zoning variance as presented.</p> <p><u>Building</u> Mr. Petruziello/ Ms. Jones</p>
Motion by:	
Motion	<p>To approve the proposal with the following conditions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The windows be corrected on the southern façade. • The railing/fence have a meter that is consistent with the brick bay beneath it. • The actual certificate not be issued until staff has verified that BZA has approved the variance.
Vote:	7-0 to approve (variance)

C.	Applications for Zoning, Code Enforcement and/ or Conceptual Review	
1. address	1350 North High Street	Kroger
app no.:	UID_18-11-006	
applicant:	David Hodge	
reviewed:	Exterior Building Alteration	
5:50– 6:35		
Recusals		
Staff Report:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Petruziello Recused himself • Mr. Teba presented a staff report and slides of the site location and existing site conditions. • David Hodge, Mack Delong, John Youngkin, Amy McCormick, Lisa McKissick, and David Spaulding presented the proposal. 	
discussion:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Fleming pointed out that there was a liquor store on the corner. • Mr. Hodge conceded that it was part of the problem, but there are larger issues going on in the area. • Mr. Grado stated that Kelling and Cole initiated the creation of the Community Crime Patrol and bicycle patrol in the district. Loiterers need to be constantly moved. He asked how often Kroger employees are telling the loiterers to move. • Mr. Delong responded that he goes out there daily. He can only ask them to leave, he cannot physically move them. However, he doesn't feel safe going out their either. • Mr. Grado said the Community Crime Patrol and the Division of Columbus Police were created to help move people as well as the anti-loitering legislation. There has to be a persistence in the process. North Side mental health across the street needs to be serviced, and removing the bench is not acceptable. • Mr. Fleming said that society has an obligation to help serve even the most poor, and that 	

removing the bench does not solve the issues at hand.

- Mr. Hodge stated that Kroger was a valuable asset to the community and a great corporate citizen. They shouldn't have to be on the defensive on this issue. This is a serious safety issue. If COTA wants to put a bench in the ROW they are welcome to.
- Mr. Grado said that they should arrange for it.
- Mr. Papineau asked Mr. Grado how that is Kroger's responsibility.
- Mr. Grado responded that if they eliminate the bench, they are limiting the access to the patients for North Central Mental Health.
- Mr. Reeds said to Mr. Grado that you aren't reducing access, you are reducing the ability to sit under a bench.
- Mr. Papineau added that if COTA adds a bench, then the police are saying they have additional regulations they can enforce.
- Mr. Grado said the bench should be there because Frank Petruziello designed it in that fashion.
- Mr. Papineau asked Mr. Grado if he thought they would have designed it in such a fashion if they had realized it would be such an issue.
- Mr. Grado said they shouldn't tear it out without the bus stop for COTA being proposed as well.
- Mr. Hodge asked how it was a bus service issue when most of the people sitting on the bench aren't bus riders.
- Ms. Jones stated that she would support removal of the bench, but she didn't feel that would solve Kroger's problems.
- Mr. Grado asked if they could keep the bus stop as long as the bench is removed.
- Mr. Kerry said the bus stop would stay.
- Mr. Grado apologized that he had misunderstood the proposal.

Motion by: Mr. Jones / Mr. Reeds

Motion: To approve the proposal as presented

Vote: 4-1 to approve

D.

Public Forum

1.

IKE Kiosks

app no.:
applicant:
reviewed:
6:35– 7:00

Greater Columbus Convention and Visitor Bureau

Staff Report:

- Mr. Teba presented a staff report and slides of the site location and existing site conditions.
- Ms. Kori Fowler (Orange Barrel Media) and Ms. Kari Kauffman (Experience Columbus) and David Hodge presented the proposal.

discussion:

- Mr. Reeds asked if the pillars were static.
- Ms. Fowler replied that it was printed art work.
- Mr. Papineau asked if the pillars main screen was not interactive, but the side screen was.
- Ms. Fowler replied that he was correct, the main screens of the pillars are static, but there is a small interactive screen on the side.
- Mr. Petruziello asked who would curate the advertising and who benefitted from the advertising income.
- Ms. Fowler replied that the ad content was created by Orange Barrel media. The ad revenue would help pay for maintenance of the Kiosks, and some money would go to the city as well.
- Mr. Petruziello asked if there was already a negotiated deal, and if all Kiosks were being placed in the ROW.
- Ms. Fowler replied that there was a negotiated deal and they were looking for the Board's support.
- Mr. Grado said he did not have a problem with the static Kiosks, but he had a problem with the advertising. The district has been working very hard for years to remove advertising in the district. Since the early 90's they were trying to declutter the streets. Without the University District

financially benefitting from the proposal, it was just a financial scheme. He could see adding a Kiosk at the Gateway, but to line High Street with advertising Kiosks is going against decades of work by the board.

- Ms. Kori Fowler replied that the businesses on High Street would be allowed on the Kiosks for free.
- Mr. Grado said this was a way of circumventing the prohibition of advertising on the building surfaces.
- Ms. Kauffman said that the advertising was not the main purpose of the Kiosks. The main purpose was for visitors to get additional information, and the businesses to get additional revenue.
- Mr. Grado said they were already capitalizing on their users.
- Ms. Jones asked if the applicant had a breakdown of the revenue and where the money would go.
- Mr. Hodge asked if they could be allowed to complete the presentation first.
- Ms. Jones stated that it was a yes or no question. It was getting late and she would like an answer to her question about the fiscals.
- Ms. Fowler said she did not have that information at hand.
- Ms. Jones said that information would be helpful. She appreciated the hard work they had put into the proposal, but the sidewalks are already cluttered, and she would like to see that space go towards more dynamic uses. The public sidewalk doesn't benefit from this sort of advertising in the community space. It doesn't make her love her city or want to inhabit her city any more.

Motion by: **Steven Papineau**

Motion: **To Vote on Recommendation of Support**

Vote: **3-3**

2. Staff Approvals for Windows

app no.:
applicant: **Staff Presentation**

reviewed:

6:35– 7:00

Staff Report: **Mr. Teba presented the staff proposal.**

discussion:

- Mr. Fleming felt that it was a reasonable proposal that would help create better results and put them more in-line with the other review boards.
- Ms. Jones asked why staff was proposing the change.
- Mr. Teba answered that the code language in the plan regarding historic preservation and windows was very strong, and justified a more stringent process. Staff would not approve vinyl in potentially contributing structures going forward, so this provides another path to approval for the applicant.
- Mr. Petruziello supported the change, but worried the cost of the windows would be prohibitive. The proposed change would however lead to better overall results. He asked if staff could do some additional research into other window options.
- Mr. Teba said he would look into it. If adopted, the Board and staff could always re-evaluate and adjust the process moving forward.

Motion by: **Steven Papineau**

Motion: **To Vote on Recommendation of Support**

Vote: **6-0**

E.	7:00- 7:02	Staff Issued Certificates of Approval		
			Items approved:	
1.		UID_19-01-001 233 King Avenue	Porch	12/21/2018
2.		UID_19-01-002 321 West 8 th Avenue	Porch	12/21/2018
3.		UID_19-01-003 105-105.5 McMillen Avenue	Porch	12/21/2018
4.		UID_19-01-004 88-90 McMillen Avenue	Porch	12/12/2018
5.		UID_19-01-005 247 Chittenden Avenue	Windows	1/11/2019
6.		UID_19-01-012 131 East 15 th Avenue	Roof	1/17/2019
	Motion:	To approve the staff approvals		
	Vote:	6-0 to approve		
F.	7:02-7:04	Board Approved Applications Issued Certificates of Approval		
			items approved	COA issued
1.		UID_17-03-001 85-95 East 10 th Avenue	New Construction (Sliver)	1/14/2019
2.		UID_18-11-008 1770 Indianola Avenue	Variances (Chi Omega)	1/8/2019
3.		UID_18-12-007 38 East Sixth Street	Variances (Parking)	1/9/2019
4.		UID_18-06-007 95,97-99,101-103,107-109,113 East 11 th Ave	Multi-Family	12/21/2018
5.		UID_18-09-007 139-141 West Ninth Avenue	Multifamily	1/17/2019
G.		Next Meeting		
1.		February 28,2019 111 North Front Street, Room 204 4:00pm		